

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/913,970	MARKHAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel M. Sullivan	1636	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Daniel M. Sullivan.

(3) _____.

(2) Shawna Cannon Lemon.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 September 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,7,25-27,29,31-33,37 and 47

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The parties discussed amendment of claims 1, 7, 29 and 47 to place claims 1, 4, 7, 29 and 47 in condition for allowance. The Examiner also informed Ms. Lemon that claims 25-27, 31-33 and 37 are subject to rejoinder upon allowance of claims 1 and 7. However, the Examiner believes that the claims, which are directed to products intended for pharmaceutical use and processes of gene therapy, are not enabled by the disclosure. In order to expedite allowance of claims not directed to therapeutic use, Applicant agreed to cancel claims 25-27, 31-33 and 37 prior to receiving an action on the merits of those claims. Ms. Lemon also informed the Examiner that Applicant intends to file a petition to add inventors. The Examiner stated that the inventorship should be corrected prior to payment of the issue fee (i.e., by amendment under Rule 1.312)..